

1 JON D. RUBIN, State Bar No. 196944
VALERIE C. KINCAID, State Bar No. 231815
2 JASON S. ROSENBERG, State Bar No. 252243
DIEPENBROCK HARRISON
3 A Professional Corporation
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1800
4 Sacramento, CA 95814-4413
Telephone: (916) 492-5000
5 Facsimile: (916) 446-4535

EXHIBIT CAW-037

6 Attorneys for
California American Water Company
7

8 **BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA**
9 **STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD**

10
11 In the Matter of Draft Cease and Desist Order
No. 2008-00XX-DWR Against California
12 American Water Company
13

TESTIMONY OF F. MARK SCHUBERT
(PHASE 2)

14 My name is F. Mark Schubert and I am employed by California American Water (CAW) as
15 the Director of Engineering. In this position, I manage all engineering projects and capital planning
16 activities on a state-wide basis; supervise asset planning, engineering design and construction
17 management on a state-wide basis; supervise engineering colleagues in three separate offices;
18 provide rate case support and testimony as an expert witness on capital project planning in
19 California; act as a liaison for federal, state and local regulatory agencies to ensure compliance with
20 all state and federal regulations; and supervise developer plan/engineering review activities. My
21 Statement of Qualifications was previously entered into evidence and marked as Exhibit CAW-
22 032A.

23 My testimony will touch on the infrastructure impact the remedy proposed by the
24 prosecution team in the January 15, 2008 draft cease and desist order would likely have on the
25 production and distribution system for CAW's Monterey District, and the ability of CAW to meet
26 the water demands of the Monterey Peninsula. For the purposes of this testimony, I have assumed
27 CAW has the legal authority to implement the reductions proposed in the draft cease and desist
28 order.

1 Notwithstanding CAW's diligence efforts, because of legal requirements (environmental
2 review, regulatory/permitting approval etc.), and public involvement in processes, CAW cannot
3 implement water supply projects sufficient to offset the impacts that would be caused by the
4 reductions proposed under the remedy in the draft cease and desist order. As a result, the proposed
5 remedy would result in CAW having insufficient supplies to meet demands of its customers. The
6 shortages occur for two reasons: (1) impacts on operation of the distribution system, and (2) simply
7 CAW's inability to divert sufficient water to meet demand. To appreciate the potential impacts, it
8 is important to understand certain basics of the CAW Monterey District operations. Thus, provided
9 below is a general background on CAW's existing source and production capability in the Carmel
10 Valley.

11 A. Background

12 There are eleven wells located in the Upper Carmel Valley aquifer, primarily between river
13 mile 9 and 15 of the Carmel River. Two of these wells have been completely removed from
14 service. Another seven wells are in service and available for supply purposes, however, these wells
15 cannot be used unless flows in the Carmel River are above 20 cubic feet per second (cfs) in
16 accordance with CAW's Conservation Agreement with NOAA Fisheries (Conservation
17 Agreement). These seven wells are: Robles No. 3, Los Laureles No. 5, Los Laureles No. 6, Panetta
18 No. 1, Panetta No. 2, Garzas No. 3 and Garzas No. 4. The remaining two wells (Russell No. 2 and
19 Russell No. 4) are permitted for use by the Conservation Agreement, mainly on a rotating basis and
20 have a maximum flow level established of 1.2 cfs (0.78 million gallons per day (MGD)). Both
21 wells pump to the Carmel Valley Filter Plant for treatment prior entry into the distribution system.

22 There are ten wells (eight active) located in the Lower Carmel Valley aquifer, primarily
23 between river mile 3 and 9 of the Carmel River. One well has been completely removed from
24 service (Berwick Well No. 7). Another well, identified as the San Carlos well, is currently
25 disconnected from the system. Scarlett Well No. 8 is very rarely used because the well reportedly
26 has bacterial problems which are reportedly associated with poor well casing seal. The remaining
27 seven wells are in service and available for supply purposes. These seven wells are: Berwick No. 8,
28 Begonia No. 2, Manor No. 2, Schulte No. 2, Pearce No. 1, Cypress No. 1 and Rancho Canada No.

1 1. All seven wells pump into a common raw water transmission main, which ultimately transfers
2 the groundwater to the Begonia Iron Removal Plant (BIRP) for treatment.

3 From the BIRP, a pressurized system moves water to end users. The BIRP consists of 18
4 dual media pressure filters, with a total combined treatment capacity of 18 MGD. The water
5 supplied by the Lower Carmel Valley wells to BIRP usually is sufficient to maintain high enough
6 water pressure to allow pumping through the plant and into the Monterey District's distribution
7 system. The finished (or treated) water flows to the existing 1.5 million gallon (MG) Segunda
8 Reservoir, which refills the reservoir and maintains pressure in the main gravity gradient that
9 supplies the southern and western portions of the Monterey District service area. It is important to
10 understand that the Segunda Reservoir is critical because it provides suction pressure to three
11 booster pumps located in the adjacent Segunda Booster Station. The booster pumps allow this
12 facility to replenish and supply 0.25 MG of water to the Crest Reservoir (located further up the hill
13 on a ridge), where the water then flows into Seaside and adjacent eastern portions of the Monterey
14 District service area.

15 A key part of the treatment process involves the cleaning or "backwashing" of the pressure
16 filters located at BIRP. This action is achieved by using finished water directly from the finished
17 water transmission main as it leaves BIRP. During periods of high customer demand when BIRP is
18 operating at peak capacity of 18 MGD, water produced by BIRP must also be available to satisfy
19 the increased system demand resulting from these backwashing activities. Basically, from a
20 technical standpoint, when one pressure filter is backwashed during periods of high demand, an
21 additional four or five pressure filters are needed to provide the required backwash flow rate. This
22 backwashing event causes a reduction in the net amount of water that is produced from BIRP,
23 which in turn reduces supplies to the Segunda Reservoir and the overall distribution system.

24 B. Impact of Proposed Remedy on CAW Operations

25 An adequate source of supply is needed to effectively manage the production and treatment
26 of water from the most important and critical treatment plant in the Monterey District's service area
27 (e.g., BIRP). If CAW were directed to reduce its diversions under the remedy proposed in the draft
28 cease and desist order, then the effective available capacity at BIRP would decrease. This reduction

1 would result in significant constraints on CAW's overall operation, namely in being able to: 1)
2 maintain adequate distribution system pressures; 2) ensure sufficient backwash water volumes are
3 available for use at BIRP; and 3) keep the water level in Segunda Reservoir at an appropriate level.
4 Reduced diversions may cause distribution system pressures to drop below California Public
5 Utilities Commission ("Commission") and California Department of Public Health standards,
6 resulting in inadequate equalization distribution storage available to meet demands. This would not
7 allow BIRP to keep up with customer demands, thereby resulting in dangerously low levels in
8 Segunda Reservoir, and further, affecting distribution storage levels in the Pebble Beach area
9 (specifically the Forest Lake Tanks). In addition, the inadequate water volume could cause
10 shortages in the supply available to serve Carmel Valley hydrants, creating a critical public safety
11 problem, especially during dry summer and fall seasons.

12 More generally and unrelated to the system problems, if CAW reduced its pumping as
13 proposed in the draft cease and desist order, CAW will simply not have sufficient supplies to meet
14 demand. It is important to note that the supplies have been severely impacted by the reductions put
15 in place by Order 95-10; environmental constraints resulting from enforcement of the Endangered
16 Species Act (protecting the California red-legged frog and the steelhead trout); and a Conservation
17 Agreement with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries that
18 directs certain well supplies be removed from service, the minimization of flows from the San
19 Clemente Dam/Reservoir, and that a re-distribution of finished water occur within a portion of the
20 Monterey District's distribution system (specifically the Carmel Valley Village area).

21 The above-noted reductions already result in current demand exceeding supply. That has
22 been demonstrated in CAW's Comprehensive Planning Study (CPS). The CPS presents a strategy
23 for facility improvements to ensure that CAW can continue to provide safe, adequate and reliable
24 service to its customers. Specifically, the CPS: 1) analyzes and presents customer and demand
25 projections; 2) examines the need for additional source of supply; 3) evaluates the need to upgrade
26 and renovate existing water system facilities; 4) addresses existing and proposed water quality and
27 treatment standards; 5) analyzes the water system transmission, distribution and storage needs; 6)
28 identifies facility needs; and 7) presents the capital improvement plan to address these facility

1 needs. In general, the purpose of the CPS is to provide an engineering analysis which CAW
2 management can utilize, among other tools, to assist in the long-term planning process and
3 operation of the company. The 2007 CPS prepared for CAW's Monterey District details the capital
4 improvement recommendations through the year 2022.

5 A key area that receives significant attention in the CPS is customer and demand
6 projections. In general, the projections are developed based on a review of population trends,
7 historic customer and demand data, and local planning commission forecasts. The effects of water
8 conservation are considered in the Demand Projections along with the analysis of historic water
9 consumption trends. The CPS carefully evaluates and analyzes CAW facilities such as pipelines,
10 storage tanks, booster stations and provisions for emergency power.

11 The 2007 CPS identified that the total annual weather adjusted average day demand for the
12 Main Monterey system has been approximately 13.2 MGD over the last five years. Over the last
13 five years the maximum daily demand for the Main Monterey system has peaked at 19.3 MGD,
14 specifically in 2003. The Main Monterey system has experienced very little growth in customers
15 and a decrease in demand over the past five years. No significant growth in customers or demand is
16 anticipated in the Main Monterey system for the foreseeable future. Studies performed by the
17 Monterey Peninsula Water Management District have forecast the potential for approximately 30%
18 growth in demands at build-out in the Main Monterey system, based on existing building lots.
19 However, the Main Monterey system is water supply constrained and growth will not be possible
20 without an additional water supply. The 2007 CPS identified an existing current firm production
21 capacity deficit of 3.8 MGD to meet a maximum daily demand in the Main Monterey system, based
22 upon a projected maximum day demand of 19.4 MGD and a firm production capacity of 15.6
23 MGD. The resulting difference between the projected maximum day demand and the firm
24 production capacity is 3.8 MGD (19.4 MGD - 15.6 MGD). This situation reflects an overall system
25 reliability issue. Any new reductions in available water would render further inadequate the supply
26 needed to meet demands, no less "normal" emergency conditions.

27
28